DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 379 CS 011 851

AUTHOR Malone, Marilyn M.; Speaker, Richard B., Jr.
TITLE Analysis of Second Graders' Self-Knowledge of Oral Reading Miscues.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Grade 2; *Interviews; Metacognition; *Miscue Analysis; *Oral Reading; Primary Education; *Reading Processes; Reading Research; Research Methodology; Self Concept
IDENTIFIERS Louisiana; Research Suggestions

ABSTRACT

A study used a clinical interview procedure to investigate second graders' self-knowledge of pronunciation miscues during oral reading and the relationship of this knowledge to oral instructional reading level. Immediately after reading each sentence, subjects, a representative sample of 41 second-grade students from two suburban Louisiana metropolitan schools, were questioned as to whether or not they had miscued. Pronunciation miscues were analyzed and divided into four categories. Results indicated that: (1) no statistically significant linear relationship existed between reader self-knowledge of pronunciation miscues and oral instructional reading level; (2) little variation of mean pronunciation miscue ratios existed among the students across oral instructional reading levels; and (3) 29 of the subjects identified correct responses as miscues. Findings suggest that students may self-monitor their miscues yet not be proficient oral readers, and that miscue self-knowledge is of strong educational importance. To confirm its usefulness as a research tool for miscue detection, additional studies should be conducted using this interview procedure. (Contains 34 references and 4 tables of data. An outline of self-knowledge interview is attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 375 379

Analysis of Second Graders' Self-Knowledge of Oral Reading Miscues

Marilyn M. Malone

Richard B. Speaker, Jr.

University of New Orleans

Paper to be presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1994

Running Head: Self-knowledge of Oral Reading Miscues

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Malone

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS011851

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Analysis of Second Graders' Self-Knowledge of Oral Reading Miscues

During the process of learning to read, young children are often asked to read orally. While reading orally, they sometimes deviate from the printed text or make miscues. But, these young readers may or may not realize that they have miscued. During oral reading, readers must judge whether or not they have decoded words correctly, and they may make corrections when appropriate. The miscues which they do detect, and perhaps correct, are probably triggered by incongruities related to the meaning of the text, to the grammatical structure, and/or to the sound/symbol relationships. Detection of one's own miscues is a metacognitive act which is crucial in word recognition, particularly when meaning is disrupted (K. Goodman, 1970).

The link between metacognition and miscue detection, however, has not gained much attention from researchers. In the past, miscue self-knowledge has been inferred from oral reading self-correction studies that were designed for other purposes (Baker & Brown, 1984; D'Angelo, 1981; Goldsmith-Phillips, 1989; K. Goodman, 1973; K. Goodman & Y. Goodman, 1977; Ruddell & Speaker, 1985). Although oral self-corrections do indicate that the reader has self-knowledge of miscues, they may not

be an adequate indicator. For example, readers may realize they have miscued, but may not orally self-correct. Clay (1969) documented the emergence of miscue monitoring in young children and noted that a self-correction was frequently a result. Interpreters of self-correction research have drawn the conclusion that good readers monitor their own miscues better than do poor readers (Baker & Brown, 1984; D'Angelo, 1981; Goldsmith-Phillips, 1989; K. Goodman, 1973; K. Goodman & Y. Goodman, 1977; Ruddell & Speaker, 1985).

Several studies have suggested that poor readers make fewer self-corrections than do good readers (Au, 1977; Beebe, 1979-1980; Clay, 1969; Cohn, 1974-1975; D'Angelo, 1981; Recht, 1976; Weber, 1970), suggesting that poor readers are less aware of the miscues that they make than are good readers; however, the accuracy of this finding is questionable due to the manner in which the self-correction rate was computed (Share, 1990; G. Thompson, 1984). When Malone (1993) recomputed the results of the D'Angelo (1981) study using the formula suggested by G. Thompson (1984), there was little difference between oral self-correction rates. Other threats to the conclusions of these studies include differences in the length of the passages read (Malone, 1993), and a lack of attention to the difficulty of the passages (Leu,

1982). In addition, a variety of methods have been used to identify good and poor readers . It is important to note that these studies were not designed to explore miscue self-knowledge, yet they have been used to draw conclusions concerning metacognition and miscues.

Using oral self-correction as a research tool for determining miscue self knowledge is problematic. Readers may detect a miscue and internally self-correct but provide no oral evidence of their processes. Factors such as the familiarity of the word (Carnine, Carnine & Gersten, 1984), the difficulty of the text (Cecconi, Hood & Tucker, 1977; Kibby, 1979; Leu, 1982), and the word's part of speech (Clay, 1968) can influence whether or not a reader self-corrects. Teacher behavior during reading instruction may influence the oral self-correction behavior of students (Hansen, 1976; Hoffman, O'Neal, Kastler, Clements, Segel, & Nash, 1984; McNaughton, 1981; Taylor & Nosebush, 1983) as can syntactic structures of the text (Cooper & Stewart, 1987).

A direct investigation using a clinical interview procedure rather than observing and documenting oral reading self-corrections was designed to provide insight into miscue self-monitoring. The purpose of the present study was to use such interview procedures to investigate second graders' self-knowledge of pronunciation miscues during oral

reading and the relationship of this knowledge to oral instructional reading level. In particular, what are the relationships between reader self-knowledge of pronunciation miscues and oral instructional reading level?

Oral instructional reading level was determined by an informal reading inventory (Ekwall, 1956) and was the dependent variable for regression analysis in this quasi-experimental study. Pronunciation miscues were defined as oral deviations from the printed word which were of the following types: substituting a word, mispronouncing a word, substituting a non-word, reversing within words, and not pronouncing a word. The pronunciation miscues were classified into four categories based on semantic and syntactic acceptability. Ratios were computed by dividing the number of self-knowledge miscues in a category by the total number of miscues in a category; these ratios were the four predictor variables.

Because of methodological concerns, problems with using oral self -corrections as a research tool, and disparate findings concerning self -correction studies, it was not possible to speculate on the results of the present investigation based correction studies reviewed. Metacognitive theory and research concerning comprehension monitoring, however, did

suggest that there would be a positive correlation between oral instructional reading level and miscue self-knowledge.

Methodology

Subjects

The subjects were a representative sample of 41 second grade students from two suburban metropolitan schools. They were heterogeneous as to race, sex (24 females and 17 males), and reading performance and ranged in age from 7 years, 0 months to 8 years, 8 months with an average age of 7 years, 8.6 months at the time of data collection. The schools were in a large suburban district in Louisiana. Demographic information is displayed in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1 about here.]

Special education students, gifted/talented students, and English as a second language students were excluded from the study. The Houghton Mifflin Reading K-8 Program, 1989 edition was used for classroom reading instruction. At the time of the investigation, the school system was moving toward a holistic program incorporating the basal reading series. The selections in the basal readers were arranged and taught according to themes rather than according to the sequence outlined in the teacher's manual. The teachers presented the skills that went along with each

reading selection and used the enrichment activities and other ideas from the teacher's manual for whole language activities in their learning centers.

Materials and Procedure

The Ekwall Reading Inventory 2nd edition (Ekwall, 1986) was administered to determine their oral instructional reading levels, and a suitable passage to use for the interview was identified. The clinical self -knowledge interview was conducted using passages from yhe inventory to determine pronunciation miscue self-knowledge.

The clinical self-knowledge interview used in the study involved interviewing subjects while they were engaged in oral reading. The subjects were questioned concerning whether or not they had miscued at the end of each sentence immediately after they had read it. They were tested and interviewed individually by the same examiner for one session, lasting approximately 35 minutes. The examiner was an experienced, certified reading specialist. The word list and the oral passages from the inventory were administered and scored according to the instructions set forth in the inventory with the exception of the addition to each oral passage of an activity to activate prior knowledge and to set purposes for reading. The two sets of match oral passages ("A" and "C") were

counterbalanced. All sessions were tape recorded unobtrusively.

After identifying the oral instructional reading level, a suitable level passage was determined for the self-knowledge interview (see Appendix A). The nature of the interview demanded that the subjects make some pronunciation miscues while reading orally. If subjects had made no or very few pronunciation miscues, then their pronunciation miscue self -knowledge would have been difficult, if not impossible, to calculate.

The highest level passage on which students had pronunciation miscue ratios between 7% and 12%, regardless of comprehension, is the passage level that was used for the self-knowledge interview. This passage was referred to as pronunciation level. After pronunciation level was determined, the self-knowledge interview was conducted using the corresponding pronunciation level passage from the alternate form.

For the self-knowledge interview, the students were asked to read the interview passage sentence by sentence. After reading each sentence, the subjects were asked if they thought they had read the sentence correctly and if they had trouble with any of the words. If the subjects indicated difficulty, they were asked to point to the words that were difficult. When they indicated a difficult word which they had pronounced correctly, the interviewer asked why they had difficulty. Their miscues

and their responses to the interview questions were noted.

The interview passage was printed on a flip chart. The first page of the flip chart contained only the first sentence of the passage. The second page contained the first two sentences. The third page contained the first three sentences and so on in a similar manner. This format allowed the examiner to control the sentence by sentence.

The pronunciation miscues on the interview passage were analyzed and categorized into the four categories. Semantically and Syntactically Acceptable Pronunciation Miscues (SeASyA) were oral pronunciation miscues which did not affect the listener's understanding of a sentence that was read by the reader. The miscues may have been synonyms or close synonyms to the words that were in the text being read or they were sensible, logical responses. They were also consistent with standard formal English structure. For example, one subject read, "One day her father told her that she could ride in an airplane to visit her grandma and grandfather" for the text, "One day her father told her that she could ride on an airplane to visit her grandmother and grandfather." The substitutions of in for on and grandma for grandmother were categorized as SeASyA.

Semantically Acceptable/Syntatically Unacceptable Pronunciation Miscues (SeASyU) were oral pronunciation miscues which did not affect

the listener's understanding of a sentence that was read by a reader. The miscues may have been synonyms or close synonyms to the words that were in the text being read or they were sensible, logical responses. They were, however, inconsistent with standard formal English structure. For example, one subject read, "A person may enjoy living in the desert because he thinks it is beautiful, but other person may think the same place is not pretty at all" for the text, "A person may enjoy living in the desert because he thinks it is beautiful, but another person may think the same place is not pretty at all." The substitution of other for another was categorized as SeASyU.

Semantically Unacceptable/Syntactically Acceptable Pronunciation Miscues were oral pronunciation miscues which did affect the listener's understanding of a sentence that was read by a reader. They were responses which did not make sense, but they were consistent with standard formal English structure. For example, one subject read, "A desert is a place where the water is dry and often hot" for the text, "A desert is a place where the weather is dry and often hot." The substitution of water for weather was categorized as SeUSyA.

Semantically and Syntactically Unacceptable Pronunciation Miscues (SeUSyU) were oral pronunciation miscues which did affect the listener's

understanding of a sentence that was read by a reader. They were responses which did not make sense and were inconsistent with standard formal English structure. For example, if??? subject read, "The heard usually has a cow as its later, who is in change of all the other elephants" for the text, "The herd usually has a cow as its leader, who is in charge of all the other elephants." The substitutions of later for leader and change for charge were categorized as SeUSyU.

Pronunciation miscues that were the result of dialect (Smitherman, 1977) were ignored. Inter-rater reliability was established through review by an independent observer of the first five randomly numbered protocols and the last five. The Pearson correlation coefficients for the four categories ranged from .81 to .99 and all were above the set level of .80.

Results

A multiple regression analysis was used to predict oral instructional reading level based on self-knowledge of pronunciation miscues made on pronunciation level passages. The multiple regression yielded a multiple R of .56 and an R square of .31. It was not statistically significant ($F = 1.68$, $df = 4/15$, $p = .21$, $N = 41$). Contrary to what metacognitive research on comprehension monitoring suggests, the null

hypothesis, that there is no statistically significant linear relationship between reader self-knowledge of pronunciation miscues categorized according to semantic/syntactic acceptability and oral instructional reading level, could not be rejected.

The squared multiple regression correlation coefficient was used to explain the importance of the results (Schmitt, 1990; B. Thompson, 1988, 1989). It is an effect size estimate and indicates the percent of variance explained that the predictor variables in the regression equation contribute to the dependent measure (Cohen, 1977). The R-square in the present investigation implies that 31% of the oral instructional reading level can be explained by pronunciation miscue self-knowledge. Effect sizes of 10% indicate low importance, of 20% moderate importance, and of 30% high or strong importance (Cohn, 1977). Pronunciation miscue self -knowledge is, then, of distinct educational importance. It is a worthy component of the reading process and has instructional implications.

To determine whether or not the interview procedure was a more valid one than was recording self-corrections, self-corrections were tabulated on the interview passage. An oral self-correction was defined as an oral reading miscue which was corrected spontaneously by the reader (G. Thompson, 1984). An initial attempt resulting in a partial

pronunciation of a word immediately followed by a correct pronunciation and unsuccessful attempts to correct were not considered self -corrections.

A survey of the protocols indicated that eight subjects made no self -corrections on the interview passage, yet all eight indicated some miscue self-knowledge during the interview. Only three of the subjects did not detect any miscues during the interview, but those three did make self-corrections. Seventy three percent (n = 30) of the subjects detected more miscues during the interview than they self -corrected.

The method used to compute the self-correction ratio took passage length into consideration. A self-correction ratio for the self-knowledge interview passage was determined by dividing the number of self -corrections made on the passage by the total number of words in the passage. This self-correction ratio was compared with the total self-knowledge ratio (the number of miscues detected on the interview passage divided by the total number of pronunciation misces each subject made on the passage).

The mean total self-knowledge ratio (TSR Mean = . 379) was higher than the mean interview passage self-correction ratio (CR Mean = . 016) .

Apparently the interview method was measuring more miscue detection than was recording self-corrections.

A correlation and a factor analysis provided evidence that different processes were probably measured by the self-knowledge interview and by noting self-correction behavior. A Pearson correlation coefficient (r = -.1824, $p > .05$) indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between interview passage self-correction ratio and total self-knowledge ratio.

A principal components factor analysis using a varimax rotation was performed on seven ratios. (See Table 2).

[Insert Table 2 about here.]

The ratios used were the four self-knowledge ratios that were the predictor variables and three self-correction ratios from three different (instructional level passage, the pronunciation level passage, and the interview passage). Three of the self-knowledge ratios loaded onto factor I (SeASyA, SeASyU, SeUSyU), labeled "Semantic and Graphophonemic Self -Knowledge." The three self-correction ratios loaded onto factor II (instructional, pronunciation, and interview passage ratios), labeled "Self -Correction." The SeUSyA ratio loaded onto factor III, labeled "Syntactic Self-knowledge." Because the self-correction ratios loaded on a factor

different from that of the self-knowledge ratios, self-correction data and interview data are probably measuring two different constructs, self -correction and self-knowledge. Descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 3.

[Insert Table 3 about here.]

During the miscue self-knowledge interviews the students were stopped at the end of each sentence. To determine whether or not these interruptions interfered with passage comprehension, the students' comprehension on the pronunciation level passage of the oral reading inventory was compared with their comprehension on the self-knowledge interview passage. The interview passage was a matched passage at the pronunciation level. A comprehension score was computed by dividing the number of questions the student answered correctly by the total number of comprehension questions asked. The mean comprehension score on the passage used to determine pronunciation level was .500 (s.d. = .226). On the passage from the alternate form at the same level but used for the self-knowledge interview, the mean comprehension score was .485 (s.d. = .271). The Pearson correlation coefficient for comprehension scores on these two passages was .66 (N = 41) and was statistically significant at the .01 level. There was little difference in the subjects' comprehension

of the two passages at pronunciation level, indicating that stopping the students at the end of each sentence had little effect on their processing of the text. This result is similar to Speaker's (1987) finding that interruptions which included elaborative processing did not affect recall or comprehension.

Differences among pronunciation miscue ratios which indicate the reader's difficulty with the text had little influence on the results. An examination the mean pronunciation miscue ratios of the subjects on the interview passage at each oral instructional reading level indicated that there was little variation among the students across oral instructional reading levels (mean pronunciation miscue ratios ranged from .086 to .104). This was further verified by the Pearson correlation coefficient between oral instructional reading level and pronunciation miscue ratio (r = .1378, N = 41) which was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Distribution of subjects for oral instructional reading level and pronunication level is presented in Table 4.

[Insert Table 4 about here.]

Discussion

Previous research concerning comprehension monitoring suggested that students who were efficient readers would detect more of their own

miscues than less efficient readers would, but this prediction was not verified. Monitoring comprehension and monitoring miscues are probably two different processes and proficiency in one may not be positively related to proficiency in the other. In addition, the use of self-correction research as an indicator of miscue monitoring and to draw conclusions concerning the detection of miscues by good and poor readers is of questionable value. When interpreting research, caution must be exercised because inaccurate over-generalizing could take place. Using research to answer questions other than those originally posed can create threats to validity.

The results indicated that students may self-monitor their miscues yet not be proficient oral readers and that miscue self-knowledge is of strong educational importance. It initiates both the overt and the covert self-correction sequence. Apparently, second grade readers do detect many miscues that they do not correct during oral reading (the average was approximately 38%). Readers may fail to correct a miscue because they correct some of them silently, because they lack the necessary decoding knowledge, or because they lack a correction strategy. Some students found all of their uncorrected miscues and were efficient detectors while others found very few and were poorer monitors. While

constructing meaning, readers may not always converge on a word as having disrupted it. Apparently, some students need help with detecting those words which are upsetting the sense and/or with appropriate decoding and miscue correction strategies. The oral reading correction procedures suggested by Hansen (1976) and Mudre and McCormick (1989) may be of great benefit to these students.

A survey of the protocols indicated that 29 of the subjects identified correct responses as miscues. When asked what gave them difficulty with the words, a variety of responses were given. Their replies referred to graphophonemic, meaning, sentence syntax, and pronunciation problems. In most cases it appeared that the students realized the words were not words they knew at sight and that they had to figure them out. The interview revealed processes not normally observed through an informal oral reading inventory and miscue analysis. The subjects were having processing problems, but these problems were not resulting in a miscue. Perhaps miscue analysis, while allowing the investigator to discover many things about children's reading, is not as wide a window on the reading process as would be possible by combining it with other techniques such as interview questions. Such deviations have been suggested by Gipe (1991, p. 79) and by Miller and Yochum (1991). Including

interview questions such as the ones used in this study may aid the diagnostician in gathering information concerning a student's perceptions of his/her own reading and of word recognition strategy use. Insights concerning how the learner constructs the reading reading process can be gleaned. This information will help the diagnosis to be more of a process oriented assessment incorporating careful observation rather than a product or score oriented assessment.

To confirm its usefulness as a research tool for miscue detection, additional studies should be conducted using this interview procedure. The interview questions might be expanded to probe the students' processing while reading. The procedure might be extended to explore how miscue self-knowledge operates during silent reading.

References

Au, K. H. (1977). Analyzing oral reading errors to improve instruction. The Reading Teacher, 31, 46-49.

Baker, L. & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.). The handbook of reading research (pp. 353-394). New York: Longman.

Beebe, M. J. (1979-1980). The effect of different types of substitution miscues on reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 15, 324-336.

Carnine, L., Carnine, D. & Gersten, R. (1984). Analysis of oral reading errors made by economically disadvantaged students taught with a synthetic-phonics approach. Reading Research Quarterly, 19, 342-356.

Cecconi, C. P., Hood, C. P., & Tucker, R. K. (1977). Influence of reading level difficulty on the disfluencies of normal children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 20, 463-474.

Clay, M. (1968). A syntactic analysis of reading errors. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 7, 434-438.

Clay, M. (1969). Reading errors and self-correction behaviour. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 39, 47-56.

Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (Rev. Ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Cohn, A. S. (1974-1975). Oral reading errors of first grade children taught by a code-emphasis approach. Reading Research Quarterly, 10, 616-650.

Cooper, B. A. & Stewart, K. J. (1987). The influence of variations in syntax on oral reading fluency. Journal of Reading Behavior, 19, 159 -175.

D'Angelo, K. (1981). Correction behavior of good and poor readers. Reading World, 21, 123-129.

Ekwall, E. E. (1986). Ekwall reading inventory. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gipe, J. P. (1991). Corrective reading techniques for the classroom teacher. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Goldsmith-Phillips, J. (1989). Word and context in reading development: A test of the interactive-compensatory hypothesis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 81, 299-305.

Goodman, K. 5. (1970). Behind the eye: What happens in reading. In K. S. Goodman & O. S. Niles (Eds.), Reading processes and program (pp. 3 -38). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Goodman, K. S. (1973). Miscues: Windows on the reading. In K. S. Goodman (Ed.), Miscue analysis: Applications to reading instruction (pp. 3-14). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Goodman, K. S. & Goodman, Y. (1977). Learning about psycholinguistic processes by analyzing oral reading. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 317-333.

Hansen, C. L. (1976). The generalization of skills and drills vs. corrective feedback instruction to the independent reading performance of intermediate aged learning disabled boys (Doctoral dissertation. University of Washington). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 4280-4281A. (University Microfilms No. 77-582)

Hoffman, J. V., O'Neal, S. F., Kastler, L. A., Clements, R. O., Segel, K. W., Nash, M. F. (1984). Guided oral reading and miscue focused verbal feedback in second-grade classrooms. Reading Research Quarterly, 19, 165-198.

Kibby, M. W. (1979). Passage readability affects the oral reading strategies of disabled readers. The Reading Teacher, 32, 390-396.

Leu, D. J. (1982). Oral reading error analysis: A critical review of research and application. Reading Research Quarterly, 17, 420-437.

Malone, M. M. (1993). Self-knowledge of oral reading pronunciation miscues among second grade readers. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans).

Miller, S. D. & Yochum, N. (1991). Asking students about the nature of their reading difficulties. Journal of Reading Behavior, 23, 465-485.

Mudre, L. H. & McCormick, S. (1989). Effects of meaning-focused cues on underachieving readers' context use, self-corrections, and literal comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly, 14, 89-113.

McNaughton, S. (1981). The influence of immediate teacher correction of self-corrections and proficient oral reading. Journal of Reading Behavior, 13, 367-371.

Recht, D. R. (1976). The self-correction process in reading. The Reading

Teacher, 29, 632-636.

Ruddell, R. B. & Speaker, R. B. (1985). The interactive reading process: A model. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.) Theoretical models and processes of reading (3rd ed.) (pp. 751-793). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Schmitt, D. R. (1990). Looking at educational differences - Impact for evaluators. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Washington, D. C.

Share, D. L. (1990). Self-correction rates in oral reading: Indices of efficient reading or artifact of text difficulty? Educational Psychology, 10, 181-186.

Smitherman, G. (1977). Talkin and testafyin: The language of black America. Houghton Mifflin.

Speaker, R. B. (1987). Elaboration and prediction in the processing and retention of elementary science texts (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 2526A.

Taylor, B. M. & Nosebush, L. (1983). Oral reading for meaning: A technique for improving word identification skills. The Reading Teacher, 37, 234-237.

Thompson, B. (1988). A note about significance testing. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 20, 146-148.

Thompson, B. (1989). Statistical significance, result importance, and result generalizability: Three noteworthy but somewhat different issues. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 22, 2-4.

Thompson, G. 8. (1984). Self-corrections and the reading process: An evaluation of evidence. Journal of Research in Reading, 7, 53-61.

Weber, R. M. (1970). First-graders' use of grammatical context in reading. In H. Levin & J. P. Williams (Ed.), Basic studies on reading (pp. 147 -163). New York: Basic Books.

Table 1

Distribution of Subjects N = 41

	Total		School #1	School #2
	n	%	n	n
School				
School #1	18	43.9	18	-
School #2	23	56.1	-	23
Teacher				
A	5	12.2	5	-
B	23	56.1	-	23
C	3	7.3	3	-
D	7	17.1	7	-
E	3	7.3	3	-
Sex				
Female	24	58.5	9	15
Male	17	41.5	9	8
Ethnic Groups				
Native American	2	4.9	0	2
African American	14	34.1	3	11
Hispanic American	2	4.9	2	0
European American	23	56.1	13	10
Total Non-European Amer.	18	43.9	5	13
Total European American	23	56.1	13	10
Retained				
Repeated a Grade	2	4.9	1	1
Never Repeated	39	95.1	17	22
Chapter 1 Participation				
In Chapter 1	3	7.3	0	3
Not in Chapter 1	38	92.7	18	20
Years at the School				
1 year	7	17.1	2	5
1.5 years	2	4.9	1	1
2 years	2	4.9	1	1
2.5 years	1	2.4	0	1
3 years	28	68.3	13	15
4 years	1	2.4	1	0
Basal Reader Placement				
Adventures (2-1 reader)	38	92.7	15	23
Caravans (3-1 reader)	3	7.3	3	0

Table 2

Factor Structure Matrix after Varimax Rotation

		Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
Eigenvalues		2.5099	1.96203	1.01085
Variance		35.9%	28%	14.4%
Ratio	Communality			
SeASyASR	.72243	.81653		
SeASyUSR	.79581	.79476		
SeUSyASR	.89246			.94142
SeUSyUSR	.88419	.79137		
InsCR	.66905		.81435	
PCR	.76478		.72673	
IntCR	.75414		.78377	

SeASyASR = semantically and syntactically acceptable self-knowledge ratio
SeASyUSR = semantically acceptable/syntactically unacceptable self-knowledge ratio
SeUSyASR = semantically unacceptable/syntactically acceptable self-knowledge ratio
SeuSyUSR = semantically and syntactically unacceptable self-knowledge ratio
InsCR = instructional passage self-correction ratio
PCR = pronunciation passage self-correction ratio
IntCR = interview passage self-correction ratio

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for All Variables N = 41

	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
SeASyASR	36	.311	.380	.000 to 1.000
SeASyUSR	32	.091	.255	.000 to 1.000
SeUSyASR	28	.256	.344	.000 to 1.000
SeUSyUSR	40	.495	.284	.000 to 1.000
OIRL	41	2.122	1.288	-1.000 to 4.000

Note: An oral instructional reading level (OIRL) of -1 designates below preprimer level; 0 designates preprimer level.

Table 4

Distribution of Subjects According to Oral Instructional Reading Level (OIRL) and Pronunciation Level (PL) N = 41

Passage Level	OIRL n	OIRL %	PL n	PL %
-1	3	7.3	-	-
0	2	4.9	2	4.9
1	4	9.8	1	2.4
2	13	31.7	2	4.9
3	16	39.0	6	14.6
4	3	7.3	10	24.4
5			6	14.6
6			4	9.8
7			6	14.6
8			2	4.9
9			2	4.9

Note: An oral instructional reading level (OIRL) of -1 designates below preprimer level; 0 designates preprimer level.

APPENDIX A

Outline of Self-Knowledge Interview

SAY: I AM GOING TO ASK YOU TO READ THIS PASSAGE ABOUT _____ ONE SENTENCE AT A TIME. AFTER YOU READ EACH SENTENCE, I WILL ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS. SOMETIMES THERE ARE NO REAL ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS I WILL ASK YOU. I JUST WANT TO KNOW WHAT YOU THINK.

The examiner will briefly relate the topic of the passage to the subject's prior knowledge by asking a question and/or by making a statement about the topic. Then the examiner will get the subject to predict what might happen in the passage.

Step 1

Using a marker, expose the first sentence for the student to read.

Say: COULD YOU READ THIS SENTENCE ALOUD?

Do not give any help. If the student hesitates or asks for a word to be pronounced, tell the student to go on.

Record miscues.

Go to Step 2 even if there are no miscues.

Step 2

Say: DO YOU THINK YOU READ THAT SENTENCE CORRECTLY?

Record response.

Say: DID YOU HAVE TROUBLE WITH ANY OF THE WORDS?

Student indicates difficulty with a word(s):

Say: WHICH WORDS DID YOU HAVE TROUBLE WITH?

WHICH WORDS DID YOU READ INCORRECTLY?

POINT TO THE WORDS.

ANY OTHERS?

Record response(s).

Go to the next sentence.

Student indicates no difficulty with any words:

Record response.

Go to the next sentence.

If the student did not make any miscues on Step 1 but indicated on Step 2 that a word(s) gave him/her difficulty say:

WHAT GAVE YOU DIFFICULTY WITH THAT WORD?
and/or
WHY DID YOU HAVE TROUBLE WITH THAT WORD?

Record the student's response(s).

At the end of the passage, ask the student if what he/she thought might happen in the passage really happened. Then ask the comprehension questions.